## IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

**In re Application of:** Robert A. Luciano *et al.* **Examiner:** Hsu, Ryan

**Application No.:** 10/750,275 **Group Art Unit:** 3714

Filing Date: December 30, 2003 Confirmation No. 9180

**Office Action Date:** July 25, 2007 **Docket No.** 83336.0989

Title: VOUCHER GAMING SYSTEM AND METHOD Customer No. 66880

Commissioner for Patents P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

## **RESPONSE TO OFFICE ACTION**

This amendment is timely filed in response to the Office action mailed July 25, 2007.

## **INTRODUCTORY COMMENTS**

Claims 1, 3, 9-11, 13, 15-18, 20, 23, 24, 29, 33, 36, 40, 41, 43, and 45-48 are pending in the present application. Claims 1, 3, 13, 15-18, 20, 23-24, 29, 33, 36, 39, 41, 43, and 45 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claims 1, 3, 9-11, 13, 15-18, 20, 23-24, 29, 33, 36, 40-41, 43, and 45-46 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112 ¶ 2 as being indefinite. Claims 1, 3, 9-11, 13, 17-18, 20, 29-30, 33, 39-41, and 45-46 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Wilms, U.S. Patent No. 5,277,424, in view of Congello, U.S. Patent No. 6,296,569, further in view of Rowe *et al.*, U.S. Patent No. 6,682,421, and in further view of Walker *et al.*, U.S. Patent No. 6,012,983. Claims 15-16, 23-24, 36, and 43 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Wilms in view of Congello, further in view of Rowe, further in view of Walker, and further in view of Skratulia, U.S. Patent No. 5,690,335.

Claims 1, 13, 15, 16, 20, 30, 33, and 41 have been amended. Claims 47 and 48 are new. No claims have been canceled. No new matter has been added. The Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the rejected claims, and contend that the differences between the claimed invention and the cited references are such that the claimed invention is patentably distinct over the cited references.

1 Doc. # CC-163931